



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The Religion of the Achaemenian Kings. First Series. The Religion according to the Inscriptions.—By Professor A. V. WILLIAMS JACKSON, of Columbia University, New York City. With an Appendix by Dr. LOUIS H. GRAY.¹

IN one of the most striking passages of Isaiah, the Lord God Jehovah speaks 'to His Anointed, to Cyrus, whose right hand I have grasped,' saying, 'I myself will go before thee; ways will I make level, Doors of bronze will I break in pieces, and bars of iron cut asunder; And I will give thee the treasures of darkness and the hoards of secret places; for it is I, JHVH, who calls thee by thy name, I, the God of Israel. For the sake of Jacob, my Servant, and Israel, my Chosen, I called thee by thy name, I took delight in thee though thou knewest me not' (Is. 45. 2-4, Cheyne's translation). This is Cyrus the Great, Cyrus the Achaemenian, Cyrus the hero of Xenophon's ideal Greek romance, Cyrus the Persian king whose name is still honored after the lapse of centuries.

But what was the creed of this 'friend of JHVH' (Is. 44. 28), and what was the faith of those Achaemenian rulers, Darius, Xerxes, and Artaxerxes, whose names are known to history? This question is one of interest and of importance alike to Biblical students and to students of the faith of Ancient Iran; for it was less than a century before the Babylonian Captivity and the coming of Cyrus, that the great teacher Zoroaster arose as the prophet of Ormazd and with ringing voice exhorted men to eschew evil and to choose the good. The significance as well as the interest which this problem of the religion of the Achaemenian kings has for the investigator, is shown by the number of studies which have already been made upon it. The present research is undertaken not with the expectation of making clear all points connected with the Achaemenian faith, nor with the idea of determining whether the Achaemenidae were true Zoro-

¹ I am particularly glad to have the opportunity of acknowledging the kind contribution of my pupil and friend, Dr. Louis H. Gray, whom I thank for his work in the Appendix on the Non-Iranian Inscriptions, and for his ready help in other matters of detail connected with the article.—A. V. W. J.

astrians or not; but the investigation is made with an eye to bringing together the material relating to the Achaemenian creed as fully as possible, and with a hope that perhaps some hints may be given to students with regard to the relation of the Ancient Persian kings to Zoroastrianism. A partial bibliographical list of studies in the field of the Achaemenian religion is given below.¹

The discussion of the subject and the evidence which we possess concerning the religion of the Achaemenidae will be presented in the following order :

SYNOPSIS OF THE TREATMENT.

A. The Religion of the Achaemenians according to the Old Persian Inscriptions.

- a. Introduction.
- b. Auramazda or the God of the Old Persian Inscriptions.
- c. The *Bagas* or Other Gods beside Auramazda.
- d. Mithra and Anāhita.
- e. Foy's Conjecture of Arštāt(?).
- f. Evil recognized as a Principle in the Old Persian Inscriptions.
- g. The Right Path.
- h. The Commandment of Auramazda and the Law.
- i. Religious Observance and Places of Worship.
- j. Summary.

B. The Religion of the Achaemenians according to their non-Iranian Inscriptions.

See the Appendix, pp. 177 ff.

C. The Religion of the Achaemenians according to Classical Allusions.

¹ Partial Bibliography (arranged alphabetically): Bang, *ZDMG.* xliii. 533, 674; *Muséon*, viii. 393; *Mélanges C. de Harlez*, p. 11.—Casartelli, *Compte rendu du 3^me. Congrès scientifique international des Catholiques*, i. 35-45.—Foy, *KZ.* xxiv. 63 ff.: *ZDMG.* liv. 341 ff.—Halévy, *Rev. Ét. Juiv.* i. 17-19.—de Harlez, *Rev. de l'instruct. publ. en Belg.* xxxviii. 4-15.—Horn, *Waren die alten Perser Zoroastrier?* in *Beilage zur Allg. Zeit. München*, 1895, Nr. 206, 171.—de Longperier et Roger, *9. Cong. Intern. Orient.* ii. 319-322.—Mills, *SBE.* xxxi. Introd. pp. 30-32.—Moulton, *The Thinker*, i. 401-408; ii. 308-315, 490-501.—Spiegel, *ZDMG.* ix. 183; *Ērān. Alterthumskunde*, ii. 189-191; and *ZDMG.* lii. 187-196; Tiele, *Mél. C. de Harlez*, pp. 307-312.—Vinson, *Religion des Perses de Darius, de Xerxes, Les Mages, Zoroastre.* Phare de la Loire, le 21 Mars 1881, et *Rev. de Ling.* xiv.—E. Wilhelm, *ZDMG.* xl. 105. The names of other contributors to the subject and the titles of their articles will be mentioned in the course of the paper.

D. The Religion of the later Achaemenians according to Allusions in the Pahlavi Literature and in the Shāh Nāmāh.

E. The Religion of the Achaemenians according to Other Oriental Sources.

The latter three topics will be treated in a following series, and a general discussion of the entire subject will then be given. The present paper is confined to divisions A and B.

A. THE RELIGION OF THE ACHAEMENIANS ACCORDING TO THE OLD PERSIAN INSCRIPTIONS.

a. Introduction.

‘A great god is Auramazda who created this earth, who created yonder heaven, who created man, who created peace for man, who made Darius king’ (*baga vazraka Auramazdā hya imām bumim adā hya avam asmānam adā hya martiyam adā hya šiyātīm adā martiyahyā hya Dārayavaum xšāyathiyam akunauš*, NR. a. 1-8 ; Elv. 1-8 ; Sz. c. 1-4); or again, ‘Auramazda the great, who is the greatest of the gods, it was he who made Darius king, it was he who gave to him the kingdom, by the grace of Auramazda Darius is king’ (*Auramazdā vazraka hya maθišta bagānām hauv Dārayavaum xšāyathiyam adadā haušaiy xšaθ’am frābara vašnā Auramazdāhā Dārayavauš xšāyathiya*, Dar. Pers. d. 1-5)—these are the lines which ring clearly with the note of fervent piety and zealous devotion, or the chord which the ancient Persian monarch Darius never tired of striking. Never was there a sovereign who felt himself more to be king by divine right, a truer Rex Dei Gratiā, than did this Achaemenian ruler. ‘By the grace of Auramazda I am king; Auramazda brought the kingdom to me’ (*vašnā Auramazdāhā adam xšāyathiya amiy Auramazdā xšaθ’am manā frābara*, Bh. I. 11-12)—‘Auramazda bore aid unto me until this kingdom was held firm; by the grace of Auramazda I hold this kingdom firm’ (*Auramazdāmai upastām abara yātā ima xšaθ’am adāry vašnā Auramazdāhā ima xšaθ’am dārayāmiy*,—Bh. I. 24-26). In every crisis and in every battle ‘Auramazda bore aid’ to Darius (Bh. I. 55, 87, etc. etc.), put his enemies to confusion, or ‘delivered them over into his hand’ (*pasāva diš Auramazdā manā dastayā akunauš*, Bh. 4. 35); every battle was won ‘by the grace of Auramazda’ (Bh. I. 94; 2. 25, etc.); and in his final summing up of his achievements, it is to the

grace of God that he ascribes all his success: 'that which I did, I did in every way by the grace of Auramazda' (*ima tya adam akunavam hamahyāyā θarda vašnā Auramazdāha akunavam*, Bh. 4. 59-60). So often does Darius take pains to attribute his success to the grace of Auramazda that we are tempted to stop and count the occurrences of the 'Dei Gratiā' phrase, and we find that *vašnā Auramazdāha* occurs no less than 34 times in the columns of the great Behistān inscription alone; and within the compass of the same 420 lines, or so, the name of *Auramazdā* is called upon fully 69 different times. The rock-records, therefore, bear evidence enough that Darius was a god-fearing king and upheld that standard to his people. The tone still echoes in the short and unimportant inscriptions of Xerxes and of Artaxerxes Mnemon and Ochus, but it seems to have lost the clear ring of the voice of the earlier monarch and to have become more or less formulaic. Still there is no question that these sovereigns were worshippers of Ormazd whatever question there may be as to their individual views, leanings, or tenets. The entire matter of the religion of the Achaemenians as set forth in the inscriptions of Behistān, Persepolis, and elsewhere, has been excellently treated in an article already referred to on p. 161, n. 1; it is by Professor L. C. Casartelli, *La Religion des Rois Achéménides d'après leurs Inscriptions*, (Compte rendu du 3^{me} Congrès Scientifique international des Catholiques tenu à Bruxelles, Septembre 1894, pp. 1-13—Bruxelles 1895). In this study Casartelli gathers together all that is said in the Old Persian Inscriptions concerning the faith of their princely authors. As my own plan includes a treatment of the religion of the Achaemenians from all the sources accessible, in addition to the Inscriptions, I must in this First Series necessarily go over this particular part of the subject again, which he has already covered. But as my results have been reached independently, I know that no one will more gladly welcome them, as agreeing in the main with his own, than the successor of Mgr. de Harlez.

(b.) *Auramazda or the God of the Old Persian Inscriptions.*

Auramazdā vazraka hya maθišta bagānām, or again, *baga vazraka Auramazdā*, are the lines that give the name and attributes of the Supreme Being of the Ancient Persian kings. The name *Auramazda*, or Ormazd, is the same as *Ahura Mazda* in the Avesta, and it signifies 'the Lord Wisdom,' 'Sovereign

Knowledge.¹ In the Avesta the name of the divinity is always written as two distinct words, each declined independently and often separated or sometimes used alone. In the Gāthās or oldest metrical hymns of the Avesta the two parts of the divine name are frequently separated by several intervening words, or even a line. In these ancient Zoroastrian Psalms, moreover, the arrangement of the two words as *Mazda* . . . *Ahura* is three times as common as *Ahura* . . . *Mazda*.² As for the Achaemenian Inscriptions themselves, there is only one instance in which we find the parts of the name divided and separately declined. The instance is on a monument of Xerxes, and therefore later than Darius; it is Xerx. Pers. ca[cb]. 17, *vašnā Aura-hya Mazdāha*. There is likewise only a single example of the use of *aura-* alone; this time, however, it is actually employed in one of the shorter inscriptions of Darius himself. The occurrence is found in Dar. Pers. e. 23-24, *šiyātīš* *Aurā nīras-ātiy* 'Peace shall descend from Aura.' So much for the divine name Auramazda.

The designation *baga*, the linguistic cognates of which in other languages may be compared, is employed in the Old Persian Inscriptions as the generic term for 'god' and its use is comparatively frequent. In the Avesta, however, the occurrences of the word are relatively infrequent; but at least two of the instances which are found in that sacred book are employed with reference to Ormazd (Ys. 10. 10; 70. 1).³ In the Inscriptions, Auramazda is called *maθišta bagānām* (Dar. Pers. d. 1; Xerx. Elv. 2; Xerx. Van 2) or 'the greatest or supreme of the gods'; in the Avesta Mithra is 'the very wisest of the gods,' *baγanəm asti aš.xraθ-wastēmō* (Yt. 10. 141) and in Yt. 10. 1 Mithra is spoken of as

¹ Cf. *Grundriss der iranischen Philologie*, ii. 632.

² For statistics see West, *JRAS.* xxii. 508 ff. (1890), and Tiele, *Iets over de Oudheid van het Avesta*, p. 16 (in the *Mededeelingen d. K. Ak. v. Wetenschappen*, Afd. Let. 3de Reeks, Deel xi. p. 380, Amsterdam, 1895). Cf. also Casartelli, *La Religion*, pp. 37-38.

³ For the other instances of *baya* see Justi, *Hdb. der Zendsprache* s. v. *baya*, *bayōdāta*, and (?) *hubaya*. As regards plurality, the plural *bayanəm* occurs only in Yt. 10. 141 in the Avesta, as mentioned above, but we find the plural *bayān*, *bakān* in Pahlavi, e. g. Sg. 4. 7. 29; Dk. 8. 15. 1 (West, SBE. xxiv. 128, 130-131; xxxvii. 34). In this last passage we are informed first of 'the worship of Aūharmazd, the highest of divinities (*bakān*)'—a phrase very similar to the one employed by Darius—and, secondly, we learn of 'the worship of the angels.'

but little lower than Ahura Mazda himself. The phrase even recalls the words of the Psalmist extolling the Lord as 'exalted far above all gods' (Ps. 97. 9; cf. also Ex. 15. 11; 18. 11; Deut. 10. 17; Ps. 82. 1; 95. 3; 97. 7, and notice C. de Harlez, *La Religion persane* p. 6).

The attribute *vazraka* 'mighty, great,' as well as *mahišta* 'supreme, greatest' manifest the belief in the sovereign power and exalted majesty of Auramazda; he is the great god, the highest of the gods, just as Darius himself is 'the great king, the king of kings' (*xšāyathiya vazraka xšāyathiya xšāyathiyānām*, Bh. I. 1 et passim). The supreme power and divine omnipotence of Auramazda is sufficiently evidenced in the triumphs which he gives to his chosen Darius, who is as much the favored one of Ormazd as is Aśoka 'the Beloved of the Gods' in India; but it is equally manifested in what he divinely causes to be done through the king's agency.¹ Darius proudly proclaims that when Auramazda 'saw this earth in dire confusion he brought her unto me' (*yaθā avaina imām bumim yudiyā* (?) *pasāvadim manā frābara*, NR. a. 32, cf. also Casartelli, *La Religion*, p. 39) and the king firmly believes that he was chosen to carry out the sacred mission because he was a just king and not a sinner.²

Above all functions assigned to the godhead is that of the creative faculty. Ahuramazda 'created' (*adā*) the earth, the heaven, mankind, and all the blessings that are vouchsafed to man. The sentence from the inscriptions referring to Auramazda's creative power has been quoted in full above; it is similar to the glorification of Ahura Mazda in the Avesta as the one 'who created the cow and righteousness; who created the good waters and plants; who created light, earth and all good things' (*yē gamcē ašmēcē dāt apascē dāt urvarāscē vanuhiš raočāscē dāt būmimcē vispācē vohū*, Ys. 37. 1). Compare also the noble Gāthā passage on creation, Ys. 44. 3-5, also Ys. 57. 17, as well as the standing epithet *dātar* 'creator' in the formulaic Avestan address to the deity. This emphasis of the idea of Ormazd's creative activity is a cardinal tenet of the whole Iranian faith; it is repeated not only in the single shorter inscriptions of Darius but it is retained as a hallowed formula in the tablets of Xerxes and of Artaxerxes Ochus. With regard to the

¹ The idea is implied in Bh. 4. 50-52; I, 12, etc.; NR. a. 32.

² Compare the thought in Bh. 4. 61-67.

idea of creation itself, nothing is said to show that the creation is a bringing forth *ex nihilo*, but the root $\sqrt{d\bar{a}}$ - in the inscriptions is used only of Auramazda among all divinities,¹ and I have touched elsewhere upon the possibility of the idea.²

While dealing with the formula in which Auramazda is spoken of as the one 'who created this earth, who created yonder heaven, who created man' (see above), we must emphasize its closing words, 'who created peace for man'—*hya šiyātim adā martiya-hyā*. The word *šiyāti* denotes repose, quiet, blessing, prosperity, joy, peace, like its Avestan cognate *šāiti* (see especially Vd. I. 1) and like the root $\sqrt{šā}$ - and its kindred, New Pers. *šād* etc. The employment of the word, as Casartelli, p. 41, hints, may possibly contain an echo of the felicity of man in the golden age; but it seems more likely if we imagine that *šiyātis*³ denotes the same idea that is alluded to by 'peace' or 'welfare' in the Deutero-Isaiah (45. 7) with its Persian coloring. We remember that Jehovah says 'I form the light, and create darkness: I make peace, and create evil,' or as Cheyne's version reads 'I am JHVH, and there is none else—Who forms light, and creates darkness, who makes welfare and creates calamity.' The Judæo-Persian text has *סלאמתי* i. e. Arab. *سلامة* 'peace.' Dr. Gray calls attention to Esther 3. 13 (= Apoc. Esth. 13. 2) 'peace desired by all men on earth'—*τὴν ποθουμένην τοῖς πᾶσι ἀνθρώποις εἰρήνην*, and notes that Keiper, *Die Perser des Aeschylus*, pp. 22–23 compares Aesch. Pers. 852, 918 with the idea contained in the Old Persian. The question of the possible connection or the degree of relationship between the Isaiah passage and the Achæmenian faith has been often commented upon and variously estimated.⁴

As Auramazda is the author of peace as well as creator and preserver of all mankind, he is especially besought to assist in

¹ For the occurrences of $\sqrt{d\bar{a}}$ - see Spiegel, *Die altpersischen Keilschriften*², p. 225.

² See *Grundriss der iranischen Philologie*, ii. Kap. vii. (soon to appear).

³ The occurrences in Old Persian are: *šiyātis* Dar. Pers. e. 23; *šiyātim* Dar. Elv. 5; NR. a. 4 NR. b. 2; Sz. c. 2; Xerx. Pers. da [db]. 4; Xerx. Pers. ca [cb]. 3; Xerx. Elv. 6; Xerx. Van 5.—The occurrences in Avestan are Vd. I. 1; Vsp. 7. 3; Yt. 17. 6; 17. 10; Yt. 22. 2; Fragm. Dk. ed. Peshotan, vol. 3, p. 131.

⁴ See, for example, Stave, *Einfluss des Parsismus*, p. 46 ff., p. 64 ff., where bibliographical references are given. Cheyne, *Psalter*, p. 269, calls Is. 45. 7 a protest against Babylonian dualism.

trouble and to give protection from harm. Thus in the crisis with the pseudo-Smerdis Gaumāta, Darius says 'I called upon Auramazda for aid; Auramazda brought assistance unto me' (*adam Auramazdām patiyāvahaiy Auramazdāmai upastām ābara*, Bh. I. 54), or again in his prayer for deliverance from evil: 'may Auramazdā protect me from evil, and protect also my family, and also this land; I beseech Auramazda for this, may Auramazda grant this unto me' (*mām Auramazdā pātuv hačā sar . . . utāmai viθam utā imām dahyāum aita adam Auramazdām jadīyāmiy aitamaiy Auramazdā dadātuv*, NR. a. 51-55);¹ or once more, Auramazda is invoked 'with the all (or clan ?) gods' to protect the country 'from an invading horde, from famine, and from the Lie' (*manā Auramazdā upastām baratuv hadā viθaibiš багаibiš utā imām dahyāum Auramazdā pātuv hačā haināyā hačā dušiyārā hačā draugā aniya or abiy (?)*² *imām dahyāum mā ājamīyā mā hainā mā dušiyāram mā drauga aita adam yān . . m jadīyāmiy Auramazdām hadā viθaibiš багаibiš aitamaiy Auramazdā dadātuv hadā viθaibiš багаibiš*, Dar. Pers. d. 13-24).³ Similarly Xerxes prays that 'Auramazda with the gods' may protect him and what he has made, and that 'Auramazda with the gods' may protect that which his father Darius made (cf. *mām Auramazdā pātuv hadā багаibiš utā tyamai kartam utā tyamaiy piθ'a Dārayavahauš xšāyabiyahyā kartam avašči Auramazdā pātuv hadā багаibiš*, Xerx. Pers. ca[cb]. 12-15; Xerx. Pers. da[db]. 18-20). A discussion of what is meant by the allusion to the 'gods' is postponed for the moment in order to confine the attention to Auramazda as the protector of mankind. In referring to the chiselled monuments which Darius has caused to be inscribed with his achievements the king adds an invocation of blessing upon all who take care to preserve the inscription: 'may Auramazda be thy friend, and may thy family be large, and do thou live long, and let Auramazda make greater for thee whatsoever thou wilt do' (*Auramazdā θuvām dauštā biyā utātaiy taumā vasiy biyā utā dargam jīvā utā tya kunavāhy avataiy Auramazdā mazānam (?) kunautuv*, Bh. 4. 74-76). On the contrary he imprecates the curses of Auramazda upon any one that may injure or destroy the

¹ On *sar* . . . which is probably to be read *sar(ā)*, see below, p. 171.

² For the reading *aniya* see Spiegel, *Ap. Keil.*² p. 48 and note; also consult the photographic reproduction in Stolze; but WB. prefer *abiy*.

³ On *viθaibiš багаibiš* see discussion below.

inscription: 'may Auramazda be thy slayer . . . and whatever thou shalt do, may Auramazda destroy that for thee' (*Auramazdātaiy jantā biyā . . . utā tya kunavāhy avataiy Auramazdā nikantuv*, Bh. 4. 78-80).¹ From this we may infer that Ormazd in the Ancient Persian creed was at times looked upon as a god of justice and avenging wrath, or we might speak of Auramazda as the Psalmist of old spake of Jehovah, as the Lord that turneth 'man to destruction,' as well as the god that saith, 'return, ye children of men.'²

(c) **The Bagas or Other Gods beside Auramazda.**

From two of the passages quoted in the preceding paragraph and from several others that may be cited, it is seen that Auramazda, although supreme and the ruler of the universe, is not the only divinity that is recognized as existing. He is 'the greatest of the gods' or *maθišta bagānām*, but there are 'other gods' beside him. See also Stave, *Einfluss des Parsismus auf das Judentum*, pp. 118-120. In his general thanksgiving Darius says that 'Auramazda, and the other gods that are, brought assistance to me' (*Auramazdāmai y upastām abara utā aniyā bagāha tyaiy hantiy*, Bh. 4. 61 and 63).

By the side of Auramazda also there is special mention of 'all the gods' or perhaps originally 'the clan gods' (*hadā viθaibiš багаibiš*) which are alluded to a half dozen or more times. Whether *viθaibiš* or *viθibiš* is to be read, and whether the 'all' gods or the 'clan' gods are to be understood, has been much discussed, as will be noticed hereafter, but perhaps Brunnhofer, *Iran und Turan*, p. 200, has come as near to the truth as any one when he makes the two ideas practically the same. The question will be reviewed below in the Appendix. But whatever view be held, there can be little doubt that the *aniyā bagāha* or *viθaibiš багаibiš* of Darius are the τοῖς ἄλλοις θεοῖς or the πάντες θεοί alluded to in Xenophon's romance of Cyrus (cf. Cyrop. 3. 3. 21; 8. 3. 11; 1. 6. 1; 7. 5. 57; 8. 73—see Second Series) or Οὐρανίη and Μίρρα, the divinities that are mentioned beside the supreme deity of the Persians in Herodotus, 1. 131. See the discussion below.

¹ Cf. also Bartholomae, *IF.* ix. 260 n.

² Compare also Plutarch, Artaxerxes 30 = p. 111. A somewhat similar idea, though partly eschatological, is implied in the Zoroastrian Gāthās, Ys. 43. 4-5, cf. Ys. 47. 4. On this compare also Eugen Wilhelm, *ZDMG.* xl. 105-106.

(d) **Mithra and Anāhita.**

These two names, Mithra and Anāhita, are the names of two divinities familiar in all Iranian literature. They belong no doubt to the *bagas*. In the two inscriptions of Artaxerxes Mne-mon (Art. Sus. a. 5 and Art. Ham. 6) they are mentioned together beside Auramazda—*Auramazdā Anah[i]ta utā M[i]tra*—all three being invoked for aid and protection. In like manner Artaxerxes Ochus in his prayer calls upon Auramazda and Mithra: ‘may Auramazda and the god Mithra protect me and protect this country and that which has been made by me’ (*mām Auramazdā utā M[i]θra бага пātuv utā imām dahyum utā tya mām kartā*, Art. Pers. a [b]. 24–26). The general position of Mithra and Anāhita in the Iranian religion has been sufficiently discussed elsewhere (bibliographical references will be found in my article in *Grundriss der iran. Philologie*, ii. §§ 40, 43). It is enough here to say that neither of these divinities is mentioned in the Gāthās, and as they are first invoked by Artaxerxes Mne-mon it is generally regarded as retrogression or descent from the standard of Darius; but this is a matter to be more fully considered, and Mitra-Mithra, as a divinity, goes back to the period of Indo-Iranian unity.

(e) **Foy’s Conjecture of Arshtāt (?).**

In *KZ.* xxxv. 45, Foy in his interesting studies upon the Inscriptions conjectured that in the difficult word *ābaštām* or *abištām* the *b* has been miswritten or is misread instead of *r*, and that we are to read *arštām*. This would be the acc. sg. fem. of *arštāt*, the genius of Uprightness, one of the personified abstractions which appears in Zoroastrianism—see Jackson, *Gdr. iran. Phil.* ii. 638. He again repeats the same idea in *ZDMG.* liv. 304, n. 1, to the effect that ‘*ābaštām* statt *arštām* vermeisselt oder von Rawlinson verlesen ist.’ This is very ingenious and it would be very attractive as supporting the view that Darius was a Zoroastrian, on which we need all help that can be obtained; but it is difficult to believe that the royal stone cutter made a mistake in the letter, and we must suspend judgment until the rock itself is examined again and the exact reading determined, before we can give a decision on the question, or hazard a theory based upon the uncertain decipherment. The common reading of this word will be referred to below, p. 172.

(f) **Evil recognized as a Principle in the Old Persian Inscriptions.**

The question whether dualism formed a tenet in the creed of the Achaemenians has been much discussed; and, owing to the lack of emphasis of dualistic traits in the Inscriptions, the claim has been made that the earlier Achaemenian monarchs, for this very reason, could not have been Zoroastrians, and that they did not believe in dualism. I have already presented this matter in *Gdr. d. iran. Philologie* ii. 628, and have given the usual reason why there was no special call to mention Ahriman in these edicts. But whatever may be said on the subject, as I there stated, we have the principle of Evil plainly recognized in *Drauga* 'Falsehood, Lie.' In the Achaemenian Inscriptions this noun is as much a personification of a Satanic being as is *Druj* in the Zoroastrian Gāthās (see also *Gdr. d. iran. Phil.* ii. Chap. vi. A and C). Furthermore, the verb *duruj* 'to lie' occurs 34 times in the inscriptions with all the evil atmosphere of the English 'to bedevil' or 'raise hell.' It is the stock word which Darius employs when he speaks of the rebellions against his divine sovereignty, for he is Ormazd's king.¹ Full of feeling he says: 'the army afterward became hostile; the Lie afterward became rife in the land, both in Persia, and in Media, and in the other lands' (*pasāva kāra arika abava pasāva drauga dahyauvā vasiy abava utā Pārsaiy utā Mādaiy utā aniyāuvā dahyušuvā*—Bh. 1. 33-35). Or again he says: 'these lands which became confederate, it was the Lie that made them confederate, so that they lied unto the people' (*dahyāva imā tyā hamiθ'iyā abava draugadiš hamiθ'iyā akunauš tyā imaiy kāram adurujiyaša*,—Bh. 4. 33-35).

In the same spirit it is prescribed that 'the man who is a liar' (*martiya hya draufana*, Bh. 4. 38, 68) shall be severely punished, and there is deep fervor in the hope of Darius that what he has written in his inscription may not be regarded as 'falsified' (*duruxtam*, Bh. 4. 49). The king lays especial stress on the fact that divine aid was granted him inasmuch as he was 'not hostile, not a liar, not a crooked-dealer' (*yaθā naiy arika āham naiy draufana āham naiy zurakara āham*, Bh. 4. 63-64).² Other evil forces are recognized in another prayer of Darius to Ormazd:

¹ Darmesteter, *Études Iranienes*, i. 45 n., thinks that *drauga* is political, not religious, in its implication; but it seems to me that the religious as well as the political is implied in this word.

² On *zurakara*, or *zūra*° cf. Foy, *KZ.* xxxv. 22, 25, 63; *ZDMG.* liv. 358.

'may Auramazda protect this land from an (invading) horde, from Drought, from the Lie; may no enemy (?) come to this land, nor an (invading) horde, nor Drought, nor the Lie (*imām dahyāum Auramazdā pātuv hačā haināyā hačā dušiyārā hačā draugā aniya* [or *abiy*] *imām dahyāum mā ājamīyā mā hainā mā dušiyāram mā drauga*, Dar. Pers. d. 15-12 = H. 15-20).¹ Here we have a personification in *Dušiyāra*, which corresponds to *Duž-yāirya*, the evil genius of famine, bad harvest, sterility, drought, in the Avesta (Yt. 8. 51-54, cf. also Yt. 8. 36, and see Spiegel, *Érân. Alterthumskunde* ii. 72, 139, and Jackson, *Gdr. d. iran. Phil.* ii. § 24, 60). We have also *hainā* which like the Avestan *haēnā* may almost be looked upon as a personification of the evils of invasion and rapine.

Another incarnation of evil in the form of treachery and deceit is implied in the prayer made by Darius, as already quoted above from Naqš-i Rostam: 'may Auramazdā protect both me and my clan and this my land from treachery [or deceit]'—(*mām Auramazdā pātuv hačā sar[ā] utāmaiy viṭam utā imām dahyāum*, NR.a. 52-53).²

(g) The Right Path.

The idea of the 'path' and the 'way' is familiar to us in the Bible, and it is found also elsewhere, for example in the Vedic *ṛtasya pathi, sukṛtasya pathi* (see Grassman, s. v. *pathi*), which is comparable with the Avestan *ašahe paiti pantəm*, Yt. 10. 86, Vd. 4. 43, and especially Ys. 72. 11, or again it is found in the 'path' of Buddhism.³ The Ancient Persian Inscriptions contain the same idea. In the closing words of the Naqš-i Rostam inscription Darius makes an earnest appeal unto his people individually: 'O man, let not the commandment of Auramazda

¹ Spiegel, *Alt Pers. Keil.*² p. 49 n. 18, favors *aniya*, although WB. prefer *abiy*. See above, p. 167, n. 2.

² The reading *sar[ā]* is due to my conjectural explanation proposed in *JAOS.* xx. 55. The Bab. and New S. (or New Elam.) versions favor this view of evil, and with Old Pers. *sara* we may also compare Simh. *saṣa, sula* 'deceit,' Geiger *Etymol. des Singh.* No. 1492, and Gray, *Indo-Iranian Phonology*, § 179. I suppose I am hardly entitled to quote from Professor Justi's letter mentioning Av. *sarajan* to Dr. Gray.

³ Recall especially the communication of H. Baynes on 'The Idea of the Path and the Way in Oriental Mysticism,' at the Paris Inter. Oriental Congress in 1897.

seem unto the evil ; leave not the path which is right ; sin not' (*martiyā hyā Auramazdāhā framānā hauvtaiy gastā mā θadaya paθim tyām rāstām mā avarada mā starava*, NR. a. 56-59).¹ The phrase *paθim tyām rāstām* recalls again the Avestan *razištəm pañtəm* Yt. 10. 3, cf. Ys. 68. 13, and other references to *paθ-* and *aθvan* collected in *Gdr. d. iran. Philol.* ii. 626.

(h) The Commandment of Auramazda, and the Law.

The words *hyā Auramazdāhā framānā*, 'the Firmān of Ormazd, or the Commandment of Auramazda,' as cited in the preceding paragraph, would be sufficient in themselves to show that the Law of Mazda formed the standard which Darius upheld. But whether that Commandment was the Avesta of Zoroaster, as we know it, or some other Avesta as priestly code, or not an Avesta at all, has been much discussed. It is necessary here to present a paragraph on the subject and then to return to it later.

The special passage which originally called up the discussion is one that is both defective and extremely difficult to interpret. It is Bh. 4. 64. The text was read by Rawlinson as *upariya abištām upariya ya . . .*; Spiegel² gave *upariy abaštām upariy mām*; Weisbach and Bang now have *upariy ābištām* (?) *upariyāyam*; so that the reproduction of the actual characters on the stone seems to be uncertain. Oppert, in 1872, was the first to set the ball a-rolling. In *Jour. Asiat.*, 6^{me} sér., xix. 295 (1872) he read *apariy ābaštām upariyāyam*, with the rendering, 'secundum legem regebam,' and saw in *ābaštā* the prototype of the Avesta. The basis for this reading and interpretation he especially found in the version of the Inscriptions whether Scythian, Median, New Susian, or New Elamitic, and this version he translated in 1879 by, 'j'ai gouverné conformément à la Loi,' adding in the footnote, 'La loi, en perse *ābaštā*, le prototype du mot d' *Avesta*.' See Oppert, *Le peuple et la langue des Mèdes*, p. 151 and also pp. 155, 183, 186. Further support for this has

¹ The principal references on the reading and interpretation of the single words in this injunction, which has been much discussed, will be found in Bartholomae, *IF.* vii. 228 n., *ZDMG.* xlv. 552, xlv. 296; Bang, *ZDMG.* xliii. 530; Fr. Müller, *WZKM.* iii. 146.

² For further discussion of Bh. 1. see Weisbach, *Achämenideninschriften zweiter Art*, pp. 77, 95; Jensen, *Zeitschr. für Assyriol.* vi. 181 ff. (quoted below, p. 182, n. 2); Foy, *ZDMG.* lii. 597, liv. 361.

been given on the claim that the Babylonian renders this phrase by *ina dēnātu*. Yet on this point see hereafter. Oppert's own strong argument for his view was based on the short and difficult paragraph Bh. I., which is found only in the second or New Elamatic of the three languages. This paragraph he rendered : 'Et Darius le roi dit : Par la grâce d' Ormazd, j'ai fait une collection de textes ailleurs en langue arienne, qui autrefois n'existait pas. Et j'ai fait un texte de la Loi (de l'*Avesta*) et un commentaire de la Loi, et la Bénédiction (la prière, le *Zend*), et les Traductions. Et ce fut écrit et je le promulguai en entier ; puis je rétablis l'ancien livre dans tous les pays et les peuples reconnurent.' If such be the real tenor of the New Elamitic statement, few things could be more important or more satisfactory with regard to the political history of Mazdaism, or especially Zoroastrianism, as Darmesteter, Spiegel, de Harlez, and other scholars have observed. But, alas, Oppert's view does not seem to have met with general acceptance.

Darmesteter, writing in November, 1879, argued with hesitation, yet with firmness, against it in the Introduction to his *Zend-Avesta*, SBE. iv. p. lii. n. 2 (publ. in 1880). What he says covers the ground so well that it is worth repeating in part. After presenting Oppert's view and his rendering of the paragraph, he says : 'The authority of Oppert is so great, and at the same time the passage is so obscure, that I hardly know if there be more temerity in rejecting his interpretation or in adopting it. Yet I beg to observe that the word *dippimas* [which Oppert renders as 'textes'] is the usual Scythian transliteration of the Persian *dipi*, 'an inscription,' and there is no apparent reason for departing from that meaning in this passage ; if the word translated 'la Loi,' *ukku*, really represents here a Persian word *Abašta*, it need not denote the *Avesta*, the religious book, as in that case the word would most certainly not have been translated in the Scythian version, but only transliterated ; the ideogram for 'Bénédiction, prière,' may refer to religious inscriptions like Persepolis I.; the import of the whole passage would therefore be that Darius caused other inscriptions to be engraved, and wrote other edicts and religious formulae (the word 'traductions' is only a guess).' So Darmesteter *op. cit.* lii. n. 2 ; see also his notes on pp. xxx, xlv ; and the same statement in *Revue Critique*, 1880, cf. *Études Iran.* ii. 7-9. Again later in his French translation *Le Zend-Avesta*, 1892-93, he refers to the

matter, i. p. xxxix. n. 1., and in iii. p. xci. repeats his rejection of Oppert's view that the Abaštā was for Darius the name of a Code, and he once more adds: 'nous concluerons donc que l'inscription ne se rapporte pas à un livre religieux et que l'on ne peut s'appuyer sur ce passage pour établir sous Darius l'existence d'un livre analogue à notre Avesta. Mais il ne serait pas moins téméraire de nier l'existence d'une littérature zoroastrienne quelconque, soit sous Darius, soit sous ses successeurs.'

Spiegel was of the same opinion as Darmesteter. In his *Alt-persische Keilinschriften*², pp. 106–109 (publ. 1881), he opposes Oppert's view on various grounds. He reviews the whole situation, but concludes (p. 109) 'dass man unter Abashtā nicht unser Awestā verstehen darf.'

C. de Harlez, *Avesta traduit*² (1881) pp. xi., cxi., allows that *ābaštā* means law but that it is law in general and not the sacred text (e. g. 'les travaux de M. Oppert nous apprennent que l'*abasta* [so printed] est la loi en général et non un terme sacré formant une sorte de nom propre'—p. cxi.). Nor was de Harlez willing to admit that Darius was a Zoroastrian. He also touched on the etymology of Avesta again in *Manuel de l'Avesta*, p. xiv., and in *BB.* viii. 176.

Weisbach, *Die Achämenideninschriften zweiter Art*, p. 73 (publ. 1890), indeed translates the New Elamitic version of Bh. 4. 64 as 'nach dem Gesetze herrschte (?) ich'; but his rendering of Bh. 1. does not find all in the passage that Oppert saw; the doubtful places he indicates by dots. Weisbach's rendering runs (p. 77): 'Der König Darius spricht: Durch die Gnade Ahuramazdas machte ich Inschriften in anderer Weise (?), [nämlich] auf arisch, was vormalis nicht war, und das grosse und das grosse und das und das machte ich, und es wurde geschrieben und ich Darauf sandte ich selbige Inschriften in alle Lande und die Leute' His comment at p. 94 merely gives Oppert's and Norris's renderings of the different ἀπαξ λεγόμενα.

Fr. Müller in *WZKM.* i. 60–63 (1887) read: (*yaθā adam utā*) *maiī taumā upariy ābaštām apariyāma* 'weil wir, ich und meine Familie, nach dem heiligen Gesetze wandelten'—notice his observation on the reconstruction and the suggested plural, *op. cit.* p. 62. The same scholar later in *WZKM.* x. 175–177 (1896) calls Oppert's identification of the form *ābaštām* 'mindestens zweifelhaft' (p. 175), or rather he says, 'alles spricht gegen die

Annahme, dass das Awesta mit dem *abaštā* oder *ābaštā* der Keilinschriften identisch ist, da wir sonst dem Worte in viel früherer Zeit begegnen und es bei den Armeniern finden müssten' (p. 176). In *WZKM.* xi. 291–292 nothing especial is added.

Bang, *BB.* xvii. 267 (1891) gave his reasons for reading *abištām* (with *i*) which he and Weisbach afterwards adopted in their edition (or rather *ābištām*, a 'Druckfehler' cf. *BB.* viii. 293); and when he later discussed the etymology in *IF.* viii. 292–293 (1898), he concluded the paragraph with a special warning: 'mit dem "Awesta" braucht das Wort nichts anderes als die äussere Form gemein zu haben: in Frankreich gabs schon vor dem "Code (Napoléon)" sogenannte "codes."'

Geldner, *Gdr. d. Iran. Phil.* ii. 2 (1896), while speaking of the etymology of the word Avesta, says that Oppert's identification with *abaštām* 'ist mindestens zweifelhaft.'

Finally, Foy in *KZ.* xxxv. 45 (1897) sought to cut the Gordian knot by avoiding the reading *upariy abaštām* altogether, and by regarding the signs as mis-carved and misread, and proposing *apariy arštām*, as discussed above, p. 169. To this suggestion he reverts again in *ZDMG.* liv. 364, n., when discussing Bang's paragraph, *IF.* viii. 292, and he adds the assurance 'dass *apariy ab(i)štām* nicht dem bab. *ina dēnātu* entspricht.' His conclusion still favors *arštām*. (In *ZDMG.* lii. 254 only the etymology of *Avestā* is touched upon.)

Such is the position of the question up to the present, so far as I know it. But after having brought forward the main points it unfortunately seems wisest to leave the vexed problem for the present, with the idea of taking it up later after actually examining the inscriptions themselves, with regard to the doubtful letters, and to wait for further advance in the interpretation of the three languages concerned, instead of hazarding a view just now. This, to be sure, may seem unsatisfactory in many respects; but it appears better than to give a dogmatic decision on evidence that is not yet complete. I can only say I shall be most glad if Oppert's view in general be found to have been on the right lines; my present inclination would be to favor such an attitude, because of the importance of its bearing. But perhaps the wish is father of the thought.

(i) Religious Observance and Places of Worship.

In the Inscriptions themselves the Ancient Persian monarchs make no direct allusion to religious ceremonies or to ritual observ-

ances. For such information we have rather to look to the description which Herodotus gives and to allusions found in other classical writers or elsewhere. These will be given hereafter. The Inscriptions, however, contain several references to prayer. King Darius, for example, speaks of having been in dire distress and says, 'then I besought Auramazda ; Auramazda brought me aid ' (*pasāva adam Auramazdām patiyāvahaiy Auramazdāmaiṣ upastām abara* Bh. I. 54-55). Or again he prays, 'this boon I ask of Auramazda with all the gods ; this may Auramazda grant me with all the gods' (*aita adam yān...m jaidiyāmiy Auramazdām hadā viθaibiš багаibiš aitamaiy Auramazdā dadātuv hadā viθaibiš багаibiš*, Dar. Pers d. 20-24). NR. a. 53-55 is very similar. For Avestan parallels in phraseology we may compare Ys. 9. 19, *iməm θwəm paōirīm yānəm haoma jaidiyemi dūraōša*, and Ys. 65. 12, *imaṭ vō āpō jaidiyemi*.

The only mention of places of divine worship which we find in the Old Persian Inscriptions is in the often quoted passage Bh. I. 62-64. This may be rendered : 'I established it [the kingdom] in its place. As before, so I made the places of worship which Gaumāta the Magian had destroyed' (*adamšim gāθvā avastāyam yaθā paruvamčiy avastā adam akunavam āyadanā tyā Gaumāta hya maguš viyaka*). The question whether the word *āyadanā* denotes 'places of worship' that belonged only to the Persians, or whether this includes also the temples of nations under the Persian sway, and as to what was the purpose of Gaumāta in destroying them, has been much debated. A discussion of this question will be found in the Appendix below, p. 180, and it will be taken up in a later series when the general deductions are drawn.

(j) Summary.

In the present series I have presented the religion of the Achaemenian kings, Darius, Xerxes, and Artaxerxes Mnemon and Ochus, purely from the objective standpoint as they are represented in their own Iranian Inscriptions. From the data given, the religion itself strikes one as being comparatively pure. Auramazda, the Lord God of Iran, is recognized as the supreme god, with other divinities beside him. Mithra and Anāhita are mentioned by name. The principle of Evil may be said to be acknowledged, although the implications are faint. The choice between the two by following the 'right path' and the 'commandment of Auramazda,' or the law, may be deduced from an

allusion in the texts themselves. Worship was regarded as an act of piety, and there were places of worship; but details regarding these are not given. Blessings are invoked in the Inscriptions and curses are imprecated, but naturally no minute injunctions are found. The necessity of speaking the truth, however, is inculcated as a cardinal tenet in the creed and the very foundation of the code of ethics. The standard of this moral and ethical code, so far as we can judge it, seems to us to be slightly lowered by the extremely cruel punishments which Darius inflicted, according to his own words. Yet we must remember that in these cases he was dealing with national offenders and traitors in the midst of perilous times.

Such at least may be said to be the impression conveyed by a study of the religion of the Old Persian kings according to the Iranian Inscriptions, which forms the subject of this first division. No material has thus far been brought in from outside; nor has any discussion been entered into as to the question whether Darius and Xerxes were followers of Zoroaster. I shall now present the additional material from the non-Iranian side in the Appendix by my pupil. For convenience also I shall include his deductions as to the Zoroastrian side of the problem, without commenting on them, and I shall take that entire matter up in a following series. I reserve also till later such a matter as that connected with the Achaemenian tombs, and similar discussions.

B. THE RELIGION OF THE ACHAEMENIANS ACCORDING TO THEIR NON-IRANIAN INSCRIPTIONS.

(APPENDIX BY DR. L. H. GRAY, PRINCETON UNIVERSITY.)

The Old Persian texts afford but a partial solution of the perplexing question of the religion of the Achaemenidae. The non-Iranian Inscriptions in Babylonian, New Susian, Egyptian, and Greek, which were carved at the command of these monarchs, add several data of importance. These contribute to our better understanding of their religious attitude and may help towards determining whether the dynasty was Zoroastrian or not.

The only scholar, so far as I know, who has touched upon this particular method of contributing to our scanty store of knowledge regarding the faith of the Ancient Persian kings is Bang, who has noted, *Mélanges C. de Harlez* 11, that the Babylonian translation by *ṭirur* of the Old Persian *ḵantā biyā* (Bh. 4. 78-79) is paralleled by Ašur-nāšir-abal's Monolith Inscription 90,

š[im]atišu liruur 'may he curse his fate.' Bang also notes that the New Susian version (Bh. 3. 77. 79) adds that Ormazd is 'the god of the Aryans' (^{an}Uramašta ^{an}nap ^{an}Arriyanam, see Weisbach *Achämenideninschr. zweit. Art.* 16-17), a phrase which is not found either in the Old Persian or in the Babylonian version.

There are, however, several other passages in these non-Iranian Achaemenian Inscriptions which may throw some light upon the difficult problem under consideration, and it is the purpose of this Appendix to bring them together for convenience.

Cyrus the Great. Among the non-Iranian texts of the Achæmenidae (a list of which is given by Weisbach, *Grundr. der iran. Philol.* ii. 63-64) one of the best known is the Cylinder Inscription of Cyrus the Great. In this cylinder Cyrus declares that he came to restore the old order of things and, as the chosen of Merodach, to make amends for the exile to K̄utu brought upon certain captive deities by Nabonid by directing their return to their own temples again. A careful study of this inscription has been made by Tiele, *Mélanges C. de Harlez*, pp. 307-312. He thinks that Merodach was, in the eyes of Cyrus, but another name for Ormazd, and he compares the mention of Nabū's name, together with that of Marduk, with the close association of Ātar with his father, Ahura Mazda, in the Avestan texts, while the other minor deities named in the cylinders are analogous, in his judgment, to the angels (Av. *yazata*) in the Zoroastrian system.

I fear that I cannot at present subscribe entirely to this view of Tiele's. Cyrus as a follower of the unreformed, pre-Zoroastrian creed (cf. Jackson, *Grundr. der iran. Philol.* ii. 617-618) may well have been as tolerant as the cylinder and the Old Testament represent him. Cyrus as a convert to the reformed teachings of Zarathushtra, all glowing with the fervor of the Master's zeal, would scarcely have treated with such complacency the godlings of an alien faith. Judging from the cylinder and speaking in terms of orthodox Zoroastrianism, Cyrus seems to me to have been a daēvayasnian, not a mazdayasnian (similar also is the view of C. de Harlez, *La Religion persane sous les Achéménides* 2, reprint from *Revue de l'instruct. publ. en Belge*, xxxviii). Judging from the cylinder my own verdict on the religious attitude of this 'shepherd of JHVH' must be, at least for the present, the one which Tiele, p. 311, rejects. It is, that the motive of Cyrus in returning to their homes the exiled gods 'was mere state-craft, even as Darius Hystaspes, whose own god was

Auramazda, later permitted himself to be called a worshipper of Amun-Rê' (see below page 184; and for further literature on this cylinder consult Weisbach and Tiele, as cited above, and Schrader's notes to his edition of the cylinder with its translation in his *Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek* iii. B. 120-127). The extremely high opinion of the religious attitude of Cyrus which is expressed by Cheyne, *Origin and Religious Contents of the Psalter*, pp. 182-183, as well as his esteem of Darius, *ibid.* pp. 280, 144, are in my judgment entirely too favorable to the Achaemenian kings. But when, on the other hand, Halévy, *Revue des études juives* i. 17-19, calls Cyrus 'un polythéiste dans le sens le plus absolu du mot,' he goes too far, it seems to me.

From the non-Iranian inscriptions of Cyrus I gain the impression that he was a true statesman in matters of religion, keeping his personal religious belief, whatever it may have been, in the background, as his position of ruler over nations of diverse faith and race required him to be 'all things to all men.'

Cambyses. Cambyses can scarcely be regarded as a Zoroastrian if his inscription on the naophoric statue in the Vatican may be taken as a criterion. In regard to the great temple at Sais, Cambyses orders all intruders in the temple to depart and to have all obstructions put there by them removed. The fane is to be purified and priests and acolytes are to be chosen in accordance with Egyptian ritual. After the complete renovation of the temple the sacred feasts are to be held again in the same manner as of old (Brugsch, *Thes. inscript. egypt.* p. 693). When Cambyses visited Sais after these commands of his had been executed, he paid homage personally to the goddess Neit and poured forth libations to Osiris 'even as former kings had done' (Brugsch, p. 694, cf. also ll. 18-23 of the text as given by Brugsch, pp. 639-640, and for the general attitude of Cambyses towards the Egyptian religion, Nickel, *Herodot und die Keilschriftforschung*, p. 90=Tolman-Stevenson, *Herodotus and the Empires of the East*, p. 94).

¹ Like Cyrus the Great, Antiochus Soter (B. C. 280-260) found it politic to honor the Babylonian divinities. The Seleucid Greek built a temple to Nabû, whom he lauded as highly as a truly devout Babylonian monarch of old could have done, and to whom he prayed with fervor for all the blessings of life. The parallelism between Cyrus and Antiochus in this respect seems to me to be both striking and suggestive (see the Babylonian text of the inscription of Antiochus in Schrader, *Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek* iii. B. 136-139).

Darius. From the Old Persian Inscriptions themselves we have evidence enough to prove that Darius was a zealous worshipper of Auramazda. The non-Iranian texts of this monarch, however, supply additional data concerning his attitude toward religion which may justly cause some reluctance, it seems to me, to consider him a genuine Zoroastrian.

The Babylonian (Bh. 25) and New Susian (Bh. I. 48) phrases equivalent to the Old Persian *āyadanā* (Bh. I. 63-64), which is usually rendered 'places of worship' (see Spiegel's und Weisbach-Bang's editions of the texts; Oppert, *JA.* 4^m série xvii. 404, *Le peuple . . . des Mèdes*, p. 167; Justi, *Grundr. der iran. Philol.* ii. 426-427, *ZDMG.* liii. 89; Foy, *KZ.* xxxiii. 420, 422, *ZDMG.* lii. 592, liv. 342-355; Gray, *AJP.* xxi. 16) seem to me quite significant. Both versions render *āyadanā* by 'houses of the gods' (Babyl. *bītāti ša ilāni*, New Sus. *"ziyan "nappanna*). In my judgment Darius repaired the *temples* of the national divinities of the peoples under his sway, 'which Gaumāta the Magian had digged down.' Why Gaumāta had destroyed these temples is not known. Perhaps a fierce iconoclastic zeal against the gods of another people had egged the usurper on; perhaps too he may have destroyed 'places of worship' of the Persians themselves through their failure to conform to the requirements of the Magian hierarchy (cf. Darmesteter, *Le Zend-Avesta*, iii. Introd. p. 71). These questions can scarcely be decided with our present sources of knowledge. At all events, I am inclined to consider *āyadanā* as including not only the fire-altars of the Ancient Persians, but the fanes of nations subject to the sway of Darius the king. If this view be a correct one, and if *āyadanā* includes 'temples' or 'houses of the gods' as well as 'places of worship,' it would seem almost impossible to assert that Darius was in harmony with Zoroastrian teaching when he rebuilt the religious structures torn down by the Magian Gaumāta. The politic course of Darius appears to have been very like that of Cyrus when he not only sent back the captive gods from K̄utu but also built them their temples anew (Cylinder Inscription 32, cf. Van Hoonacker, *Mélanges C. de Harlez*, pp. 325-329), or when he restored the Temple at Jerusalem (II Chron. 36. 22-23, Ezra I. 1-11) and thus gained the extravagant eulogy of the Deutero-Isaiah (Is. 44. 28, 45. 1-4). With a similar motive of statecraft Cambyses repaired the desecrated temple of Neit at Sais, and with a spirit quite as alien to that of the Zoroastrian reform.

The ancient Iranian horror of falsehood is well known (cf. Jackson, *JAOS.* xiii. Proc. pp. 59-61). It is noteworthy that the Old Persian Inscriptions have the word for 'lie,' *drauga*, only in the singular. The Avesta likewise has only the singular *draoça*, such a late passage as Yt. 24. 29 being no real exception. The Babylonian version, on the contrary, uses the plural of the corresponding *paršu* 'lie' in the two passages in which the word occurs: Bh. 14 *paršātu ina mātāti lū mādu* 'the lies became very numerous in the land,' Old Pers. Bh. 1. 34 *drauga dahyauwā vasiy abava* 'the Lie became rife in the land'; Bh. 100 *paršātu šina* 'they are lies,' Old Pers. Bh. 4. 49-50 *duruxtam maniyātiy* 'consider it falsified.' The New Susian, like the Old Persian, has the word for 'lie,' *titkim(m)e*, in the singular throughout. The use of the plural *paršātu* 'lies' in the Babylonian version is so much weaker than the singular 'Lie' in Old Persian and New Susian (*draoga*, *titkim(m)e*) that the usage would seem to bespeak personification among the Persians but not among the Babylonians.

The Old Persian phrase *hadā viθaibiš багаibiš* (Dar. Pers. d. 14, 22, 24) is one of much importance in the consideration of the religion of the Achaemenidae. Scholars have, almost without exception, rendered these words 'with the clan-gods' (Lassen, *ZKM.* vi. 28-30; Rawlinson, *JRAS.* O. S. x. 278; Spiegel, *Av. übers.* ii. 214, *Keilinschr.* 49; Weisbach-Bang, *Keilinschr.* 35; Windischmann, *Zor. Stud.* 123; C. de Harlez, *Av. trad.* Introd. 10; Casartelli, *Religion des rois Achéménides* 8, reprint from *CR. du 3^{me} Cong. Scient. des Catholiques*; Justi, *Grundr. der iran. Philol.* ii. 427, Anm. 2; Foy, *KZ.* xxxiii. 431; cf. also Jackson, *Grundr. der iran. Philol.* ii. 632). There are, however, grave objections to this rendering. It is true that Dar. Pers. d., where alone the phrase *hadā viθaibiš багаibiš* is found, exists only in Old Persian, but two inscriptions in Babylonian and New Susian, Dar. Pers. g. and f. (old signatures of both were H., but see Weisbach, *Grundr. der iran. Philol.* ii. 64) are very similar. From these two inscriptions we gain what seems to me to be the solution of the Old Persian phrase *hadā viθaibiš багаibiš*. The Babylonian inscription Dar. Pers. g. 24 contains the phrase *itti ilāni gabbi* 'with all the gods' (so also Xerx. Pers. ca. 11. 13; cb. 20-21. 25, where the Old Persian and the New Susian texts read only 'with the gods' *hadā багаibiš*, *"nappi-pe-itaka*, cf. also Xerx. Pers. da. 18, b. 28). The New Susian rendering Dar. Pers. f. 13-14, 20-

21, the only places where the phrase is found in this version, by 'with all the gods' *anap marpepta-itaka*, is another confirmation of my view that the Old Persian *viθaibiš* is not to be derived from *viθin* 'belonging to the clan' but from *vispa* > *vis(s)a* > *viθa* 'all,' and the old reading *viθibiš* is consequently to be rejected in favor of *viθaibiš*.¹

Justi, *Grundr. der iran. Philol.* ii. 427, Anm. 2, opposes the view which is here taken with regard to the meaning of *viθaibiš* 'denn *viθam* (den Stamm) wird von *visam* (alles) deutlich unterschieden.' At the same time it seems that the Babylonian and New Susian texts just cited, although they are, as Justi very rightly observes, not translations of the Old Persian, intimate very clearly that the Old Persian phrase *hadā viθaibiš багаибіш* is to be rendered 'with all the gods' rather than 'with the clan-gods' (similarly also Darmesteter, *Le Zend-Avesta* ii. 365, iii. Introd. p. 65; Bartholomae, *Grundr. der iran. Philol.* i. 226, § 404, *IF.* viii. 251-252). I depart with diffidence from Justi's interpretation of *āyadanā* (above p. 180) and of *hadā viθaibiš багаибіш*. It is not seemly for tyros to set aside lightly the decisions of veterans. My interpretation here suggested I regard as tentative and based merely on my best judgment at the present time.

The passage Dar. Pers. g. 1 may also be quoted in this connection. Here it is said that 'great is Ormazd, who is the greatest above all gods' (*ina muhhi ilāni gabbī*).²

A Greek inscription of Darius which was found in 1886 at Deirmenjik (see G. Cousin and G. Deschamps, *Bull. de corr. hell.* xiii. 529 ff.) is of importance in the discussion of the creed of

¹ My former view on *viθa*, *AJP.* xxi. 3, cf. also 9, I now regard as incorrect. Cf. also Foy, *KZ.* xxxv. 67.

² The view of Oppert, *Le peuple . . . des Mèdes*, pp. 155, 186, that the short and difficult inscription Bh. 1, which is found only in New Susian, contains an illusion to the Avesta and its commentaries, to the prayers, and to the translations of these sacred texts into other languages, has been discussed above, p. 172 ff. The translation of this inscription by Jensen, *Zeitschr. für Assyriol.* vi. 181 ff., is worth citing in this connection. He renders as follows: 'Der König Darius spricht: Unter dem Schutze(?) Ahuramazda's machte ich Inschriften in anderer Weise(?), auf arisch(?), welche vormalig nicht waren, und nach den Schriftzeichen [Tabellen] und nach einer "Lehrtafel" machte ich sowohl *hiš* als auch *ippi* [decrees] und sie wurden geschrieben und mir vorgelesen. Darauf sandte ich selbige Schriften in alle Länder und die Leute (folgten ?? gehorchten ?? cf. *sap* = nachdem ??).'

the Achaemenidae. The portion of the inscription which is concerned with religion is as follows (ll. 17-28): *ὅτι δὲ τὴν ὑπὲρ θεῶν μου διάθεσιν ἀφανίζεις δώσω σοι μὴ μεταβαλομένῳ πείραν ἡδικημένου θυμοῦ· φντουργοὺς γὰρ ἱεροὺς Ἀπόλλωνος φόρον ἔπρασσε καὶ χώραν σκαπανεύειν βέβηλον ἐπέτασσε, ἀγνοῶν ἐμῶν προγόνων εἰς τὸν θεὸν νοῦν, ὃς Πέρσαις εἶπε. . . .* In these words Darius distinctly informs Gadates, for whom his message is intended, that his own belief is the same as that of his fathers, whereas Gadates has been attempting to efface all traces of the king's attitude toward the gods.¹ This inscription of Deirmenjik is almost polytheistic in tone. The mention of the gods (*θεοί*), and the cordial sympathy for the religious views of his non-Zoroastrian ancestors, which Darius clearly felt, if this inscription of his may be believed, are very significant. It is indeed possible to suppose that the *θεοί* are the Amshaspands (cf. Plutarch, *de Is. et Os.* 47) or possibly the angels (*Av. yazata*), a hypothesis which is not without plausibility. Or again it may be suggested that Darius, even though a Zoroastrian, adopted temporarily polytheistic phraseology on account of the religion of the Greek Gadates. A third hypothesis might be offered that Darius held this particular shrine in honor on account of an oracle which Apollo had given the Persians in times long past (l. 28). On the whole, however, the Deirmenjik inscription conveys to me the general impression that Darius was not a Zoroastrian. This conclusion is sustained, in my judgment, by the Egyptian inscriptions of this monarch, which are next to be considered for their bearing on the problem under discussion.

The inscription of Darius found near Tell el-Maskhutih in Egypt seems to represent the king as a worshipper of the deities of the land. In a spirit quite like that shown by Cyrus at Babylon and by Cambyses in Egypt, the same Darius who, as we have

¹ The allusion to the gardeners sacred to Apollo, who were obliged by Gadates to tend unhallowed ground and to pay taxes, is not clear to me. Cousin and Deschamps compare Pausanias viii. 46, 3 (*loc. cit.* p. 532, n. 3, and cf. Kleuker, *Anhang zum Zend-Avesta* 2 Bd., 3. Theil, 69) to explain the reverence for Apollo. The god is, they suggest (p. 540), to be identified with the Fire (*Av. ātarš*, but see Rapp, *ZDMG.* xix. 73, according to whom *Ātarš* was identified with Hestia rather than Apollo; and see Darmesteter, *Le Zend-Avesta* ii. 441, who regards Mithra as the Iranian equivalent of Apollo). The *φντουργοὶ ἱεροὶ Ἀπόλλωνος* may possibly have been the priests connected with the fire-temples. See further on this inscription Stave, *Einfluss des Parsismus auf das Judentum*, pp. 55-57.

seen, restored the 'houses of the gods' (*bītāti ša ilāni* Bh. 25) uses religious phraseology on the stele of Tell el-Maskhutah which is far from Zoroastrian. The portion of the inscription which concerns us at present is as follows (ll. 1-5, see the translation by Golénischeff, *Rec. de trav.* xiii. 106-107): '(Darius) born of Neit, the lady of Neit, the lady of Sais, image of the god Ra who hath put him on his throne to accomplish what he hath begun. . . . (master) of all the sphere of the solar disc [i. e. of the sphere traversed by the solar disc]. When he [Darius] was in the womb [of his mother], and had not yet appeared upon earth, she [the goddess Neit] recognized him as her son, and granted to him . . . she hath (extended) her arm to him with the bow before her to overthrow forever his enemies, as she had done for her own son, the god Ra. He is strong . . . (he hath destroyed) his enemies in all lands, king of Upper and Lower Egypt, Darius who lives forever, the great, the prince of princes, the . . . (the son) of Hystaspes, the Achaemenian, the mighty. He is her son [of the goddess Neit], powerful and wise to enlarge his boundaries.'

In line 5 of the stele of Darius at Chaluf there is an allusion to 'an adoration made to God by his seers [of Darius].' Daressy in his discussion of this passage, *Rec. de trav.* xi. 170, thinks that these 'seers' were Magians, 'for the Egyptian religion had no priests with this name.' I do not feel qualified to decide upon this point. The impression which I gain from the Egyptian inscriptions combined with his Greek message to Gadates and added to the hints which seem to exist in his Babylonian and New Susian text is far less flattering to the monarch's religious zeal than to his political shrewdness. I regret to say that, to the best of my judgment, the lofty creed held by Darius in the opinion of many great scholars does not find a confirmation in his non-Iranian Inscriptions.

A conclusion as to the religion of the Achaemenians drawn solely from a study of their non-Iranian Inscriptions seems hardly favorable to the view that these monarchs were Zoroastrians. But an exact decision cannot be reached from such texts alone. Only by a synthesis of all data on this mooted problem can we hope even to approximate the truth.